

## FROM UNITED STATES SENATORS AND REPRESENTATIVES TO THE JOURNAL.

## Lawmakers Forecast Tariff Legislation of the Special Session.

## McKinley's Proclamation Finds the New Congress in Mood for Revision at Once.

THE proclamation issued by President McKinley Saturday calling an extra session of Congress March 15, was not unexpected. Desiring to present fairly and fully the views of members of the Fifty-fifth Congress on prospective legislation to be passed by the coming extra session, the Journal framed and presented to each a series of six questions. The inquiries were:

1. Do you favor immediate tariff legislation?
2. Do you favor an extra session of Congress for this purpose?
3. If given time for development, would the present tariff produce sufficient revenue?
4. If a new tariff is offered, should it in general policy be "specific" or "ad valorem"?
5. Do you favor a tariff on the lines of the McKinley bill or Wilson bill?
6. What industries in your district demand tariff revision, and on what lines?

Good results were obtained. There are ninety members of the Senate when the tale is complete. It lacked three of its full membership when the questions were asked, Florida, Kentucky and Oregon having failed to elect. A vacancy at the Ohio desks also came to pass, but Mr. Hanna, who will take Mr. Sherman's place, has never made a secret of his tariff opinions, and the reader may add him to the proper total.

Of the eighty-six Senators to whom the Journal questions were addressed, sixty-seven replied. Representatives of Congressional districts to the number of 247 out of a possible 257 made reply. Of the number 190 favored tariff revision and an extra session. They so stated directly, or gave room for such inference in their answers.

Forty-two Senators favored revision and an extra session, and twenty-four are registered against the propositions. In a few instances the opinions of Congressmen and Senators were obtained from their close political friends. For purposes of convenience the questions in the tabular statement are indicated by their numbers.

## OPINIONS OF LAWMAKERS.

## Senators and Representatives Give the Journal Their Views on the Coming Session.

**SENATOR JOHN W. DANIEL, Dem., Va.**—It would be best to let the tariff alone, but since the country has decided otherwise, any action taken should be immediate. The McKinley bill was entitled "An act to reduce revenue and for other purposes." It did reduce the revenue and a bill to produce revenue must be of a different order.

Quite a number of industries in my State demand tariff revision, but in general the demands are not exorbitant and the people prefer a tariff that does not create monopoly, crush trade and stifle revenue.

**SENATOR W. E. CHANDLER, Rep., New Hampshire.**—I would have agricultural products, cotton and woolen manufactures protected by tariff duties on foreign products which will make their cost when landed in our ports equal to the cost of producing home products of the same character and quality. Prohibitive duties are not asked for, but protection sufficient to enable home producers to pay American wages and yet undersell foreign products.

The foregoing statement briefly expresses Mr. Chandler's attitude during his entire public career.

**Ought to Make Grab General.** W. C. ADAMS, Dem., Fourth Georgia—My district is not a virgin territory under Republican rule. They prefer to wait Democratic action by the Fifty-sixth Congress. If, however, a paternalistic policy is to provide for special interests, and so shape legislation as to stimulate particular industries, enrich classes and develop sections, then it ought to make the grab general, and even things up by offering a bounty on our cotton and other products. If all interests were bolstered alike, either by prohibitive duties or by bounties, equality of condition would be restored and the system would at least be fair to all.

**An Absurd Proposition.** J. H. E. OSBORNE, at large, Dem., Wyo.—The stimulus of a greater production of commodities by an increase in our tariff schedules, when we are already producing more than the country needs, is an absurd proposition. I fear, however, that an object lesson is needed at this time, in order that the people may be aroused to a realizing sense of the real cause of their poverty-stricken condition, and for this reason I do not believe it wise for bimetallicists to in any manner obstruct a readjustment of the

**Surplus of \$115,000,000.** JAMES G. MAGUIRE, Dem., Fourth Missouri—I do not favor an extra session, because there is an available surplus of \$115,000,000 over and above the gold reserve, which is sufficient, with revenue now coming in, and which will increase in volume for the next three years. The present law will not produce sufficient revenue if the appropriations are to be annually increased, as by this Congress. The iron and steel industries in my district demand free coal, free pig iron, free scrap iron and scrap steel and free petroleum.

**Law Not Free Raw Material.** JOHN C. ELL, Pop., Second Colorado—The Wilson bill would raise sufficient revenue were the expenditures of the Government limited to the Government's necessities. I am, however, opposed to the foreign idea of considering the labor of the country free raw material, while the great manufacturers on the coast line are protected. I favor especially the distribution of enough revenue for the necessary expenses of the Government upon such of our products as will be benefited by an additional protection, not

**Populist Protectionist.** JAMES GUNN, Pop., Idaho—Though a Populist, I have always favored a protective tariff, and believe now, as I have ever believed, that in a properly adjusted tariff on protective lines lies the germ of our national prosperity. I also believe that a protective tariff, without an adequate volume of money on which to transact our business and facilitate exchange between our people, instead of being a blessing, is now and ever will be a curse.

The proposed tariff, like those that have gone before, will be a sham, a deception, a fraud. For this reason I am opposed to an extra session that is called for the purpose of perpetuating a swindle on a long-suffering and conflicting people.

**Work Needed for Idle People.** CHARLES E. PEARCE, Rep., Eleventh Missouri—The most pressing necessity of our country is to get our idle people to work. That can only be done by such legislation as will revive our industries in every department of activity. I am in favor of a bill that will produce that result.

We also need largely increased revenues to bring our navy up to that of a first-class power, to perfect our coast defenses, to improve our rivers and harbors, to provide proper public buildings, to enlarge and improve our permanent military posts, to supply a full equipment of modern arms and to gradually reduce the public debt by a good tariff law in connection with the internal revenue law.

I consider the McKinley law, taken as a whole, the best ever enacted up to the present time. It is possible now, with the experience had, to improve upon it.

**Something Must Be Done.** S. J. FARROWS, Rep., Tenth Massachusetts—It is evident that something must be done to increase the revenue of the Government. As it is understood that the present Congress will not pass any measure in this direction, an extra session will be necessary.

The present tariff is insufficient and unsatisfactory. Without discussing the

question as to whether there are better forms of taxation, the tariff I approve is one that is "just, fair and impartial; equally opposed to foreign control and domestic monopoly, to sectional discrimination and individual favoritism."

**High Tax Object Lesson.** W. D. VINCENT, Pop., Fifth Kansas—I am in favor of immediate tariff legislation, not because there is any virtue in a high tariff, but because it is the next number on the programme. The people should have what they vote for, and they have voted for Mr. McKinley, the high priest of high protection in America. They have had a gold standard "object lesson" now let them have a high tax "object lesson." It matters not that it has been tried before and proved a failure.

**Protection Favors Trusts.** CLAUDE A. SWANSON, Dem., Fifth Va.—With a return of trade, commerce and prosperity, the present tariff bill would raise sufficient revenue. If it does not, I am in favor of a constitutional amendment providing for an income tax. I do not believe a bill drawn on the McKinley lines will yield as much revenue as one with lower duties. It should be remembered that the title of the McKinley bill when passed was "To reduce the revenue." It accomplished its purpose by preventing the importation of foreign goods and giving the American market to trusts and combines.

The tariff, being a tax, should be adjusted as all other systems of taxation, to provide revenue for the Government, levying its exactions from people in proportion to their capacity to pay and not to give benefits and privileges to any.

**Deficit May Have Been Greater.** JOHN E. KELLEY, At-Large, Dem., South Dakota—I think it necessary to pass a revenue bill that will enable the Government receipts to meet the disbursements. To accomplish this an extra session seems necessary. It does not appear clear, however, that an increase in tariff rates will accomplish this purpose, unless such increase be placed upon the absolute necessities, such as sugar, coffee and the common grades of clothing and fabrics.

There is no evidence to show that had the McKinley law remained in force up to this time the deficit in the Treasury would not be even greater than at present.

**Reform the Currency.** JAMES HAMILTON LEWIS, At-Large, Fuson, Washington—Aside from the purpose of raising revenue and providing for the same, I would at the earliest moment provide a reform system of currency, banking and exchange. By increasing the volume of currency by the free and unlimited coinage of silver as well as gold, and the issuing of notes or greenbacks, payable in either silver or gold, and interchangeable, I would make the paper money rest upon the coin or the bullion. With the increasing of the currency, I regard it equally as necessary that provision be made that such increased money when in circulation may be deposited in banks with some sure degree of safety.

**Cannon Reserves His Fire.** JOSEPH G. CANNON, Rep., Twelfth Illinois—I prefer to answer those questions in a bunch. If my opinion in the premises is of any value to the public, the public already knows from my party affiliations and records what my opinion is. When revenue legislation is presented for consideration I will use my judgment in supporting such measures as are in harmony with policies and platforms of the Republican party, taking care that whatever legislation is enacted sufficient revenue will come therefrom and that protection will be given to American industries.

**For a Fair Tariff Measure.** ALBERT J. HOPKINS, Rep., Eighth Idaho—I favor immediate tariff legislation, and an extra session of Congress for this purpose. I do not think the present tariff law could produce sufficient revenue, and I favor a general policy of specific duties in a new tariff law. It will be drawn on lines something like the McKinley bill, and will be a fair Republican tariff measure. All of the in-

## THE JOURNAL'S POLL OF THE FIFTY-FIFTH CONGRESS.

The Journal formulated and presented to the Senators and Representatives who make up the Fifty-fifth Congress certain questions relative to the tariff and revenue situation. Appended in brief tabular form is given the results of such inquiry, being a statement of the questions asked and the character of the replies:

	Members of the Senate.			Members of the House.		
	Yes.	No.	Doubtful	Yes.	No.	Doubtful
1. Do you favor immediate tariff legislation?	42	24	...	190	57	...
2. Do you favor an extra session of Congress for this purpose?	41	24	1	190	57	...
3. If given time for development, would the present tariff produce sufficient revenue?	24	38	3	51	184	2
4. If a new tariff is offered, should it in general policy be "specific" or "ad valorem"?	Specific.	Ad valorem.		Specific.	Ad valorem.	
	42	23	...	184	53	...
5. Do you favor a tariff on the lines of the McKinley bill or the Wilson bill?	McKinley.	Wilson.	Neither.	McKinley.	Wilson.	Neither.
	35	24	5	146	49	41

discriminating, however, against any new material.

**Prefers an Income Tax.** DAVID A. DE ARMO, Dem., Sixth Missouri—I do not favor the purpose for which the extra session is to be called. I am, however, as a general policy, in favor of Congress assembling as early as possible after election. I prefer an income tax to either the McKinley or the Wilson bill. The majority of the people of my district desire no revision of the tariff in the direction of protection.

Mr. De Armo is from Butler, Mo., and represents a constituency almost wholly agricultural. The Farmers' Alliance in its days of health was strong in the section.

**General Grosvenor Faithful.** General CHARLES H. GROSVENOR, Rep., Eleventh Ohio.—As I am a member of the Ways and Means Committee, I must decline to answer two questions. The new bill ought to be higher than the McKinley law in some instances and lower in others. I think all the interests of the farmer, laborer and producer demand a revision of the tariff on protection lines. General Grosvenor it will be recalled was the author of the McKinley campaign. From his Ohio home he gave out weekly figures on majorities, some of which were verified election day.

**Reduce Expenses.** JAMES A. COONEY, Dem., Seventh Missouri—I think the present tariff would produce sufficient revenue. And if not, there are other methods more direct and less expensive to the people than an extra session. First and best, reduce expenses and appropriations. Second, levy the deficit on liquors, tobacco and other subjects of internal revenue.

These simple methods could have been applied by the Republican party at a regular session of Congress at any time during the past two years, and thereby have covered the small and diminishing deficit.

This deficit has not been, nor is it now, a subject of any solicitude to that party; without it, what feast of plunder could it have promised to the tariff barons to have aroused their courage to threats and violence in the late campaign?

**Work Needed for Idle People.** CHARLES E. PEARCE, Rep., Eleventh Missouri—The most pressing necessity of our country is to get our idle people to work. That can only be done by such legislation as will revive our industries in every department of activity. I am in favor of a bill that will produce that result.

We also need largely increased revenues to bring our navy up to that of a first-class power, to perfect our coast defenses, to improve our rivers and harbors, to provide proper public buildings, to enlarge and improve our permanent military posts, to supply a full equipment of modern arms and to gradually reduce the public debt by a good tariff law in connection with the internal revenue law.

I consider the McKinley law, taken as a whole, the best ever enacted up to the present time. It is possible now, with the experience had, to improve upon it.

**Something Must Be Done.** S. J. FARROWS, Rep., Tenth Massachusetts—It is evident that something must be done to increase the revenue of the Government. As it is understood that the present Congress will not pass any measure in this direction, an extra session will be necessary.

The present tariff is insufficient and unsatisfactory. Without discussing the

question as to whether there are better forms of taxation, the tariff I approve is one that is "just, fair and impartial; equally opposed to foreign control and domestic monopoly, to sectional discrimination and individual favoritism."

**High Tax Object Lesson.** W. D. VINCENT, Pop., Fifth Kansas—I am in favor of immediate tariff legislation, not because there is any virtue in a high tariff, but because it is the next number on the programme. The people should have what they vote for, and they have voted for Mr. McKinley, the high priest of high protection in America. They have had a gold standard "object lesson" now let them have a high tax "object lesson." It matters not that it has been tried before and proved a failure.

**Protection Favors Trusts.** CLAUDE A. SWANSON, Dem., Fifth Va.—With a return of trade, commerce and prosperity, the present tariff bill would raise sufficient revenue. If it does not, I am in favor of a constitutional amendment providing for an income tax. I do not believe a bill drawn on the McKinley lines will yield as much revenue as one with lower duties. It should be remembered that the title of the McKinley bill when passed was "To reduce the revenue." It accomplished its purpose by preventing the importation of foreign goods and giving the American market to trusts and combines.

The tariff, being a tax, should be adjusted as all other systems of taxation, to provide revenue for the Government, levying its exactions from people in proportion to their capacity to pay and not to give benefits and privileges to any.

**Deficit May Have Been Greater.** JOHN E. KELLEY, At-Large, Dem., South Dakota—I think it necessary to pass a revenue bill that will enable the Government receipts to meet the disbursements. To accomplish this an extra session seems necessary. It does not appear clear, however, that an increase in tariff rates will accomplish this purpose, unless such increase be placed upon the absolute necessities, such as sugar, coffee and the common grades of clothing and fabrics.

There is no evidence to show that had the McKinley law remained in force up to this time the deficit in the Treasury would not be even greater than at present.

**Reform the Currency.** JAMES HAMILTON LEWIS, At-Large, Fuson, Washington—Aside from the purpose of raising revenue and providing for the same, I would at the earliest moment provide a reform system of currency, banking and exchange. By increasing the volume of currency by the free and unlimited coinage of silver as well as gold, and the issuing of notes or greenbacks, payable in either silver or gold, and interchangeable, I would make the paper money rest upon the coin or the bullion. With the increasing of the currency, I regard it equally as necessary that provision be made that such increased money when in circulation may be deposited in banks with some sure degree of safety.

**Cannon Reserves His Fire.** JOSEPH G. CANNON, Rep., Twelfth Illinois—I prefer to answer those questions in a bunch. If my opinion in the premises is of any value to the public, the public already knows from my party affiliations and records what my opinion is. When revenue legislation is presented for consideration I will use my judgment in supporting such measures as are in harmony with policies and platforms of the Republican party, taking care that whatever legislation is enacted sufficient revenue will come therefrom and that protection will be given to American industries.

**For a Fair Tariff Measure.** ALBERT J. HOPKINS, Rep., Eighth Idaho—I favor immediate tariff legislation, and an extra session of Congress for this purpose. I do not think the present tariff law could produce sufficient revenue, and I favor a general policy of specific duties in a new tariff law. It will be drawn on lines something like the McKinley bill, and will be a fair Republican tariff measure. All of the in-

discriminating, however, against any new material.

**Prefers an Income Tax.** DAVID A. DE ARMO, Dem., Sixth Missouri—I do not favor the purpose for which the extra session is to be called. I am, however, as a general policy, in favor of Congress assembling as early as possible after election. I prefer an income tax to either the McKinley or the Wilson bill. The majority of the people of my district desire no revision of the tariff in the direction of protection.

Mr. De Armo is from Butler, Mo., and represents a constituency almost wholly agricultural. The Farmers' Alliance in its days of health was strong in the section.

**General Grosvenor Faithful.** General CHARLES H. GROSVENOR, Rep., Eleventh Ohio.—As I am a member of the Ways and Means Committee, I must decline to answer two questions. The new bill ought to be higher than the McKinley law in some instances and lower in others. I think all the interests of the farmer, laborer and producer demand a revision of the tariff on protection lines. General Grosvenor it will be recalled was the author of the McKinley campaign. From his Ohio home he gave out weekly figures on majorities, some of which were verified election day.

**Reduce Expenses.** JAMES A. COONEY, Dem., Seventh Missouri—I think the present tariff would produce sufficient revenue. And if not, there are other methods more direct and less expensive to the people than an extra session. First and best, reduce expenses and appropriations. Second, levy the deficit on liquors, tobacco and other subjects of internal revenue.

These simple methods could have been applied by the Republican party at a regular session of Congress at any time during the past two years, and thereby have covered the small and diminishing deficit.

This deficit has not been, nor is it now, a subject of any solicitude to that party; without it, what feast of plunder could it have promised to the tariff barons to have aroused their courage to threats and violence in the late campaign?

**Work Needed for Idle People.** CHARLES E. PEARCE, Rep., Eleventh Missouri—The most pressing necessity of our country is to get our idle people to work. That can only be done by such legislation as will revive our industries in every department of activity. I am in favor of a bill that will produce that result.

We also need largely increased revenues to bring our navy up to that of a first-class power, to perfect our coast defenses, to improve our rivers and harbors, to provide proper public buildings, to enlarge and improve our permanent military posts, to supply a full equipment of modern arms and to gradually reduce the public debt by a good tariff law in connection with the internal revenue law.

I consider the McKinley law, taken as a whole, the best ever enacted up to the present time. It is possible now, with the experience had, to improve upon it.

**Something Must Be Done.** S. J. FARROWS, Rep., Tenth Massachusetts—It is evident that something must be done to increase the revenue of the Government. As it is understood that the present Congress will not pass any measure in this direction, an extra session will be necessary.

The present tariff is insufficient and unsatisfactory. Without discussing the

question as to whether there are better forms of taxation, the tariff I approve is one that is "just, fair and impartial; equally opposed to foreign control and domestic monopoly, to sectional discrimination and individual favoritism."

**High Tax Object Lesson.** W. D. VINCENT, Pop., Fifth Kansas—I am in favor of immediate tariff legislation, not because there is any virtue in a high tariff, but because it is the next number on the programme. The people should have what they vote for, and they have voted for Mr. McKinley, the high priest of high protection in America. They have had a gold standard "object lesson" now let them have a high tax "object lesson." It matters not that it has been tried before and proved a failure.

**Protection Favors Trusts.** CLAUDE A. SWANSON, Dem., Fifth Va.—With a return of trade, commerce and prosperity, the present tariff bill would raise sufficient revenue. If it does not, I am in favor of a constitutional amendment providing for an income tax. I do not believe a bill drawn on the McKinley lines will yield as much revenue as one with lower duties. It should be remembered that the title of the McKinley bill when passed was "To reduce the revenue." It accomplished its purpose by preventing the importation of foreign goods and giving the American market to trusts and combines.

The tariff, being a tax, should be adjusted as all other systems of taxation, to provide revenue for the Government, levying its exactions from people in proportion to their capacity to pay and not to give benefits and privileges to any.

**Deficit May Have Been Greater.** JOHN E. KELLEY, At-Large, Dem., South Dakota—I think it necessary to pass a revenue bill that will enable the Government receipts to meet the disbursements. To accomplish this an extra session seems necessary. It does not appear clear, however, that an increase in tariff rates will accomplish this purpose, unless such increase be placed upon the absolute necessities, such as sugar, coffee and the common grades of clothing and fabrics.

There is no evidence to show that had the McKinley law remained in force up to this time the deficit in the Treasury would not be even greater than at present.

**Reform the Currency.** JAMES HAMILTON LEWIS, At-Large, Fuson, Washington—Aside from the purpose of raising revenue and providing for the same, I would at the earliest moment provide a reform system of currency, banking and exchange. By increasing the volume of currency by the free and unlimited coinage of silver as well as gold, and the issuing of notes or greenbacks, payable in either silver or gold, and interchangeable, I would make the paper money rest upon the coin or the bullion. With the increasing of the currency, I regard it equally as necessary that provision be made that such increased money when in circulation may be deposited in banks with some sure degree of safety.

**Cannon Reserves His Fire.** JOSEPH G. CANNON, Rep., Twelfth Illinois—I prefer to answer those questions in a bunch. If my opinion in the premises is of any value to the public, the public already knows from my party affiliations and records what my opinion is. When revenue legislation is presented for consideration I will use my judgment in supporting such measures as are in harmony with policies and platforms of the Republican party, taking care that whatever legislation is enacted sufficient revenue will come therefrom and that protection will be given to American industries.

**For a Fair Tariff Measure.** ALBERT J. HOPKINS, Rep., Eighth Idaho—I favor immediate tariff legislation, and an extra session of Congress for this purpose. I do not think the present tariff law could produce sufficient revenue, and I favor a general policy of specific duties in a new tariff law. It will be drawn on lines something like the McKinley bill, and will be a fair Republican tariff measure. All of the in-

## Large Majority Is in Favor of the Old McKinley Plan of Protection.

## Poll Shows That Party Lines Will Be Very Tightly Drawn on the Question.

build up any local interests, although located in my own State.

**J. B. Callender, Republican, New Hampshire.**—I would like woolen manufactures, lumber, granite, paper, agricultural products and possibly cotton manufactures protected by a tariff. I want it high enough to protect every American interest that comes in competition with foreign products.

**William P. Frye, Republican, Maine.**—I favor the admission of foreign products which we use and do not produce free, and a duty on everything imported competing with American products equivalent to a difference between wages here and wages abroad.

**Opinions of Representatives.** M. W. Howard, Populist, Seventh Alabama—Lumber and wool need more protection. I favor a bounty of \$5 per bale to the producer of cotton.

**Joseph Wheeler, Eighth Alabama.** Democratic member of the Ways and Means Committee—Alabama manufactures chiefly iron, and I learn it needs no protection. An owner of a large furnace writes me: "We shipped 80,000 tons of iron to Europe within the last year and sold it at a good profit. We could have sold twice that amount at good profits if we had the transportation."

**John S. Little, Democrat, Second Arkansas.**—I believe the present tariff will produce sufficient revenue to meet the expenses of the Government if economically administered, by the time the present amount in the Treasury is expended. If it does not a new tariff should be added to meet the deficiency. Lumber is the only thing in my State that could be made to produce revenue.

**Thomas C. McRae, Democrat, Third Arkansas.**—I do not think a new tariff is necessary. The taxes on the people are already heavy enough. The lumber interests of my State are insisting that they should be protected. I believe that the trouble with that industry, as with all, is the depressed condition of business. People have not the money to buy lumber, and if they can't buy at \$7 or \$8 per thousand feet they certainly cannot buy it at \$10 or \$12.

**William L. Terry, Democrat, Fourth Arkansas.**—Tariff legislation is not needed, but whatever the Republicans do in that line I hope they will do at once. For this reason I would favor an extra session of Congress. Some sawmills in my district would like protection on lumber.

**Alexander M. Dockery, Democrat, Third Missouri.**—I am a Democrat. I do not believe that the revenue from the Wilson bill, with that from two McKinley bills added, would meet the extravagant expenses of the Republicans and a small minority of the Democrats in this Congress. I want no protection.

**Richard Bartholdt, Republican, Tenth Missouri.**—I prefer a tariff bill framed on lines which would yield a revenue just sufficiently high to equalize the difference between American wages at their present high standard and cheap foreign labor. I look upon this question as a question of wages and would not vote for a bill yielding high duties for the protection of the rich manufacturers, but I do favor any measure that would keep the wages of the workmen at their present high standard. I would like an increase of duty on tin plate, and glass.

**Clifton B. Beach, Republican, Twentieth Ohio.**—I think the new bill should be a prudent modification of the McKinley bill; just such a bill as he himself would advocate were he a free lance on the floor of the House to-day. All industries should be protected along common sense lines. It should look to the interests of the producer and give him a market in Central and South American countries if for no other principle than to get rid of the surplus at cost.

**George W. Steele, Republican, Member Ways and Means Committee, Eleventh Indiana.**—We want a conservative, sensible bill, high enough to protect American labor against foreign labor. My district is one of natural gas and manufactures, and is a good agricultural section. All of these demand a revision of the tariff.

**Captain Lorenzo Sanford, Republican, Sixteenth Ohio.**—The new bill ought to be drawn on the lines of the McKinley bill, in general, but in the wool schedule the duties should be higher, rather than lower, than those of the McKinley law.

**Stephen A. Northway, Republican, Nineteenth Ohio.**—The new bill should be on a line with the McKinley bill with such modifications as existing circumstances make necessary.

**William H. Moody, Republican, Sixth Massachusetts.**—The fisheries demand a tariff which shall protect them from the subsidized fisheries of other countries. The prevailing industries are leather and shoes. We desire present tariff as regards this to be left alone.

**John F. Fitzgerald, Democrat, Ninth Massachusetts.**—I would have duties higher than in the Wilson bill and with an income tax.

**Charles L. Bartlett, Democrat, Sixth Georgia.**—There is in the Treasury of the United States to-day an available cash balance of, including the gold reserve, \$214,479,554.53, and this leaves \$100,000,000 for the gold reserve and nearly \$115,000,000 available. This, with the receipts from customs and from other sources, will be ample to meet the demands of the Government.

**Adolph Meyer, Democrat, First Louisiana.**—I favor immediate tariff legislation, inasmuch as the dominant party claims that tariff legislation will bring prosperity. I want to afford it the opportunity to do what it can in this direction. I do not think the present tariff law would ever give a sufficient revenue. I favor a bill framed so as to produce sufficient revenue to run the Government and incidentally to protect those industries that require it.

**Jesse Overstreet, Republican,**

**Seventh Indiana.**—There are more than one thousand chemical, woolen, agricultural implement factories, pottery mills and other industries in my district and they demand a revision of the tariff on protective lines so as to permit an increased business and increased wages to the employees.

**James A. Hemenway, Republican, First Indiana.**—My district has the largest hard wood lumber market in the world, as well as manufactures of pottery and agricultural implements. All of these industries want protection.

**George F. Foss, Republican, Chicago.**—We want a bill on the lines of the McKinley law, giving a moderate protective tariff. I think the revenue feature should be considered first and the protective feature second.

**Charles E. Hartman, Silver Republican, Montana.**—I favor a tariff, whenever any tariff will be useful, to adequately protect American labor and American industries, but no tariff will be of any avail in connection with the gold standard. Wool, lead and barley are the products of my district that need a tariff.

**Rudolph Kieberg, Democrat, Eleventh Texas.**—I do not believe that tariff legislation will relieve the country, and that nothing short of bimetallicism, inaugurated by the United States, will do so. In other words, the free and unlimited coinage of both gold and silver by the United States alone, at a ratio of 16 to 1, as demanded by the late Chicago platform, is the key-note to better times, and other necessary reforms, and will for the nations of the world to follow our example; legislation in the interest of the masses, rather than favored classes, is the need of the hour. Under the Chicago platform the Democratic party is committed to a tariff for revenue, without discrimination between classes, etc., and agreeably with the national platform, the District Convention of Democrats, who nominated me instructed me to vote for a tariff on wool, hides and cattle, which I propose to do. I do not believe that a special session is necessary, however, for tariff legislation merely, although the present tariff law appears to be inadequate for revenue purposes.

**Lewis Irving Handy, Democrat, Delaware.**—I favor the tariff as a means of raising revenue. It should be levied so as to get the revenue needed, and yet be the least possible burden on consumers. I do not favor the imposition of tariff duties for the purpose of promoting prosperity, because I am persuaded that such duties do not, and in the nature of things cannot promote the general business prosperity of the country. Therefore, I do not favor a tariff on the lines of either the McKinley or the Wilson bill. Neither bill was prepared with an eye single to revenue wants. The responsibility for legislation rests in the House upon the Republican majority.

**Thousands of women go down to death every year through their own ignorance and neglect.** Every woman should know something of the physiology of her womanly self. Every woman should appreciate the importance of the health and strength of the delicate organs that constitute her womanhood. The woman who neglects her health in this respect is sure to be a continual sufferer and is in constant danger of an early grave. To such a woman widowhood is a torture and motherhood a menace.

**Dr. Pierce's Favorite Prescription** acts directly and only on the organs that make widowhood and motherhood possible. It invigorates them and makes them healthy. It prepares a woman for an almost painless maternity. It does away with the dangers of motherhood. It insures the health of the newcomer in the family. Over 50,000 women have testified to its wonderful virtues. All good druggists sell it. There is nothing "just as good."

"If it had not been for your medicine and your advice," writes Mrs. I. F. Thomas, of Antioch, Pike Co., Ark., "I would not doubt be in my grave or in an insane asylum. Fourteen years ago, when my second child was born, I came very near losing my mind. My head would hurt so bad I could hardly stand it. I was so nervous I could not sleep. I was so weak I could not get up without great pain. My life was a misery to me. God alone knows what I suffered. I had lost all hope of being cured, but I took your Favorite Prescription according to directions. I used one bottle of the 'Pleasant Pellets,' two of the 'Golden Medical Discovery,' and six of 'Favorite Prescription.' In a little over one year after I began your medicine I gave birth to twins. Since then I have a boy baby ten months old. He weighs eleven pounds. I have been better in health since the birth of these children than I had been for years before. Before using your medicine my weight was about one hundred and thirty-five pounds, and now I weigh one hundred and sixty-five."

**Dr. Pierce's Pleasant Pellets** are a safe, sure